REMARKS

Claims 21-29, 31-41, and 43-48 are pending, but stand rejected. Claims 21-23, 32-34, 40, 41, and 43-45 have been amended.

As is explained below, each claim in the present application requires a redirection web page, selectively serving a redirection web page, or hosting a redirection web page. This is a limitation not taught or suggested by the references cited by the Examiner in support of the rejections. Each redirection web page includes an instruction for redirecting a client terminal to a particular information web page and serves as an indirect link between information web pages. In other words, when a browser or other terminal accesses a first information web page the browser is presented with a link to a second information web page. That link is a link to a redirection web page for the second information web page. When the link is selected, the browser retrieves the redirection web page which redirects the browser to the second information web page.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC § 112: The Examiner objected to typographical errors in Claims 21, 22, and 24. These Claims have been amended to address the Examiner's concerns

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC § 112: The Examiner rejected Claims 21-48 as being indefinite – objecting to the particular use of the terms "providing" and "redirection web page" in Claim 21. More specifically, the Examiner asserted:

> It is not clear whether the providing is done by a single server (which can be a requested web server that hosts the webpage, or it can be a proxy server located between a requestor and a web server), or whether it is done by a plurality of servers. It is also not clear whether the redirection web page is provided to a client requestor or to another webpage.

The Examiner also asserted that the use of the phrase redirection web page is

> unclear because it does not state what the redirection webpage is doing. If the redirection webpage has functionality then it must be stated, otherwise the claim will be lacking essential elements and features rendering the claim incomplete.

Addressing the Examiner's concerns, Claim 21 has been amended to removed the limitation containing the term "providing" replacing it with a limitation reciting

> selectively serving a redirection web page for each information web page, wherein a redirection web page for a particular information web page is selectively served to a client terminal following a selection of an indirect link to the selected information web page.

The Examiner states that "Claims 22-48 inherit the deficiencies of claim 21." However, only Claims 22-31 depend from Claim 21. Consequently, the Examiner's rejection of Claims 32-48 is improper as those claims do not inherit limitations from Claim 21.

The Examiner rejected Claim 22 as being indefinite asserting:

> It has not been established as to who is receiving a request and who is determining. It is also unclear if the receiving entity of claim 22 is the same as the providing entity of claim 21.

Requiring the Applicant to amend Claim 22 to indicate "who" is determining and "who" is receiving would require the applicant to include unnecessary structure in a method claim. Claim 22 is intended to be broad so that the acts of determining and receiving can be performed by any suitable structure. Such does not make the scope of the claim unclear as the particular acts required by the method are not indefinite. The Examiner appears to be asserting that Claim 22 is too broad. However,

> Breadth of a claim is not to be equated with indefiniteness. *In re Miller*, 441 F.2d 689, 169 USPQ 597 (CCPA 1971). If the scope of the subject matter embraced by the claims is clear, and if applicants have not otherwise indicated that they intend the invention to be of a scope different from that defined in the claims, then the claims comply with 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

MPEP 2173.04.

The Examiner rejected Claims 21, 32, and 43 a being incomplete for omitting essential elements. The Examiner asserts that the omitted elements are steps for requesting and responding because the preamble of Claim 21 recites "A method for supplying information." The Examiner asserts that the claims "fail to detail any information being supplied."

The use of the term "supplying" in the preamble of Claim 21 does not require the inclusion of methods steps for requesting and responding. Merriam-Webster defines the term "supply" as "to make available for use." *See* http://www.merriam-webster.com. Consequently the term "supplying" can be defined as "making available for use." Claim 21 includes a limitation reciting an act of "distributing a plurality of information web pages across a plurality of servers." Such an act serves as supplying since distributing the information web pages across the plurality of servers makes those web pages available for use. The use of the term "Supplying" does not require a request or a response. It only infers that the thing being supplied is to be made available.

Claim 32 does not include a preamble reciting "a method for supplying information." The Examiner's rejection of Claim 32 based on the inclusion of such a preamble is off-base.

Claim 43 includes a limitation reciting "hosting a plurality of information web pages on a plurality of distinct web servers." Hosting the web pages makes those web pages available.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC § 102: The Examiner rejected Claims 21, 22, 31-34, and 42-44 under §102 as being anticipated by USPN 6,826,624 issued to Fell. To properly support a §102, a cited reference must teach or suggest the specific combination of elements required by a claim.

Fell discloses an apparatus for redirecting resource access requests based on a requested resource identifier. *See, e.g.*, Fell, Abstract. Fell refers to the apparatus as a Scalable, High Availability, Server Resource Redirection apparatus or a SHASR apparatus (110). Fell, col. 2, lines 52-57. SHASR apparatus (110) operates by receiving a resource access request from a user device (105) – the access request includes a resource identifier (URL) Fell, col. 4, lines 53-61. The SHASR apparatus (110) then determines if the resource identifier is current and, if current, performs no further function. Fell, col. 4, line 55 to col. 5, line 8. If not current, the SHASR apparatus (110) determines if a previously used resource identifier matches the

requested resource identifier. Fell, col. 5, lines 8-13. If a matching previously used identifier is found, the SHASR apparatus (110):

> then issues an access request using the current resource identifier and the information in the original access request such that the requested resource will provide access to the user device 105

Fell, col. 5, lines 20-28.

In short the SHASR apparatus (110) functions to redirect direct a resource access request by

- receiving, from a user device, an access request directed to a particular resource identifier;
- determining if the particular resource identifier current or previously used; and
- if previously used, sending the access request using the current resource identifier;

The SHASR apparatus (110) does not instruct the user device to issue an access request using the current resource identifier. In other words, the SHASR apparatus (110) does not redirect the user device. Instead, the SHASR apparatus (110) redirects or forwards the access request received from the user device using the current resource identifier.

Claim 21 is directed to a method for supplying information. As amended, Claim 21 recites the following combination of elements:

1. distributing a plurality of information web pages across a plurality of servers, wherein each information web page includes an indirect link to another information web page, the indirect link being a link to a redirection web page for that other information web page and that redirection web page including an instruction to redirect a client terminal to that other information web page; and
2. selectively serving a redirection web page for each information web page to a client terminal, wherein a redirection web page for a particular information web

page is selectively served to the client terminal following a selection of an indirect link to the selected information web page.

The Examiner asserts that Fell, col. 6, lines 12-63 discloses that each of a plurality of distributed information web pages include "an indirect link to another information web page, the indirect link being a link to a redirection web page for that other information web page." To the contrary, Fell mentions nothing of a web page that includes an indirect link to another web page where the indirect link is a link to a redirection web page for that other web page. Moreover, Fell does not teach or suggest the existence or use of a redirection web page that includes an instruction to redirect a client terminal to a requested web page. As mentioned above, Fell simply discloses receiving an access request directed to a previously used resource identifier and forwarding that request using the current resource identifier.

Moreover, Fell does not disclose selectively serving a redirection web page for each information web page to a client terminal, wherein a redirection web page for a particular information web page is selectively served to a client terminal following a selection of an indirect link to the selected information web page. Fell's SHASR apparatus (110) simply does not serve a redirection web page to a client terminal.

For at least these reasons, Claim 21 is felt to distinguish over Fell. Claims 22-29 and 31 are felt to distinguish over Fell based at least on their dependence from Claim 21.

Claim 22 is also felt to distinguish over Fell based a least on its dependence from Claim 21. Moreover, Claim 22 recites the following:

(1) presenting a first information web page of the plurality of information web pages to a client terminal;

(2) receiving a request for a second information web page of the plurality of information web pages from the client terminal, the request corresponding to a selection of the indirect link included in the first information web page;

(3) determining if a server hosting the second information web page is operational; and

(4) wherein selectively serving comprises, if the server hosting the second information web page is determined to be operational, returning to the client terminal the redirection web page for the second web page, the returned redirection web page including an instruction for redirecting the client terminal to the second information web page.

The Examiner assets that Fell, col. 2, lines 1-25 and col. 3, lines 30-65 disclose determining if a server hosting a requested web page is operational. To make clear their irrelevance, those passages are reproduced as follows.

> The present invention provides a method and apparatus for determining a current resource identifier of a resource in a resource access request. With the method and apparatus of the invention, when a user device wishes to access a network resource, for example, the user device broadcasts an access request across the network. The access request includes a resource identifier. The apparatus monitors the broadcasts over the network and checks the access requests to verify that the resource identifier used in the access requests is the most current resource identifier associated with the requested resource. If the resource identifier in an access request is not the most recent resource identifier, the apparatus redirects the access request using a current resource identifier and may notify the user device of the change in the resource identifier.
>
> The apparatus makes use of a directory server to verify the resource identifiers. The directory server includes a directory of the current resource identifiers and all previously related resource identifiers. Thus, by searching the directory, the directory server may identify a network resource by its current resource identifier even if an older resource identifier is used in a resource access request.
>
> Once the apparatus has retrieved the current resource identifier from the directory server, the current resource identifier is used by the apparatus to redirect the access request to the intended network resource. In addition,

> the apparatus may return a message to the user device indicating that the resource identifier has changed and indicating the current resource identifier. This message may be output by the user device as a displayed text and/or graphical message, audio message, or the like.

Fell, col. 1, line 61 to col. 2, line 25.

> The SHASSR apparatus 110 makes use of a directory server 115 to verify the resource identifiers. The directory server 115 includes a directory of the current resource identifiers and all previously related resource identifiers. Thus, by searching the directory, the directory server 115 may identify a network resource by its current resource identifier even if an older resource identifier is used in a resource access request.
>
> The directory server 115 may be any type of directory server 115 known to those of ordinary skill in the art. Furthermore, the directory server 115 may be a Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) server. LDAP is described, for example, in RFC 1823, available on the Internet at www.ietf.org/rfc.html.
>
> The directory server 115 is periodically updated such that the resource identifiers in the directory of current resource identifiers is maintained as current as possible for the particular implementation of the invention. The directory server 115 or the SHASSR apparatus 110 may periodically request each server of each domain to which it has access, to upload their current resource identifiers along with a previously used resource identifier, if one exists. In this way, the directory server 115 or the SHASSR apparatus 110 may correlate the current resource identifier with a previously used resource identifier in the directory and maintain the relationship between the current resource identifier and all previously used resource identifiers.
>
> Alternatively, the directory in the directory server 115 may be updated automatically whenever the resource identifiers on a network server are changed. For example, if a Web page URL on an Internet server is changed, the Internet server may automatically upload the current and previously used URL for the Web page to the directory server 115 or the SHASSR apparatus 110 when the change is completed.

Fell, col. 3, lines 30-65.

Nothing in either passage even hints at determining if a server hosting a requested web page is operational. All that Fell discusses is determining if a resource identifier included in a resource access request is current or has been previously used.

Fell is completely silent on the operational status of a server hosting a requested resource.

Moreover, as Fell does not teach the use of redirection web pages, Fell does not disclose returning to the client terminal the redirection web page for the second web page where the returned redirection web page includes an instruction for redirecting the client terminal to the second information web page. Fell's SHASR apparatus (110) simply does not return a redirection web page to a client terminal.

For at least these additional reasons Claim 22 is felt to distinguish over Fell.

Claim 32 is directed to an information server system and recites the following combination of elements:

(1) a plurality of servers, each hosting a different information web page ;
(2) a redirection web page corresponding to each information web page, wherein each redirection web page includes an instruction to redirect a client terminal to the corresponding web page;
(3) wherein each information web page includes an indirect link to another information web page, the indirect link being a link to a redirection web page for that other information web page.

The Examiner rejected Claim 32 for the same reasons as Claim 21. As made clear with respect to Claim 21, Fell does not teach or suggest the use of redirection web pages let alone a system that includes *a redirection web page corresponding to each information web page, wherein each redirection web page includes an instruction to redirect a client terminal to the corresponding web page.* For at least this reason, Claim 32 is felt to distinguish over Fell. Claims 33-41 are also felt to distinguish over Fell based at least on their dependency from Claim 32.

Claim 33 is also felt to distinguish over Fell based a least on its dependence from Claim 32. Moreover, Claim 32 recites the following:

(1) a central server operable to receive a request for an information web page from a client terminal, determine if one of the plurality of servers hosting the requested information web page is operational, and to return a redirection web page corresponding to the requested information web page if the server hosting the requested information web page is determined to be operational; and

(2) wherein the redirection web page corresponding to the requested information web page is operable to cause the client terminal to request the requested information web page

As made clear with respect to Claim 22, nothing in Fell even hints at determining if a server hosting a requested web page is operational. All that Fell discusses is determining if a resource identifier included in a resource access request is current or has been previously used. Fell is silent on the operational status of a server hosting a requested resource. Moreover, as Fell does not teach the use of redirection web pages, Fell does not disclose returning a redirection web page to the client terminal. Fell's SHASR apparatus (110) simply does not return a redirection web page to a client terminal.

For at least this additional reason Claim 33 is felt to distinguish over Fell. Claim 34 is felt to distinguish over Fell based at least on its dependency from Claim 33.

Claim 42 was previously cancelled.

Claim 43 is directed to a method of supplying a website and recites the following combination of elements:

(1) hosting a plurality of information web pages on a plurality of distinct web servers; and

(2) hosting a plurality of redirection web pages on a central web server;

(3) wherein each information web page includes an indirect link to another information web page, the indirect link being a link to a redirection web page for that other information web page, wherein that redirection web page includes an instruction for redirecting a client terminal to that other information web page.

As made clear with respect to Claims 21 and 32, Fell does not teach or suggest the use of redirection web pages let alone the hosting of a web page that *includes an indirect link to another information web page, the indirect link being a link to a redirection web page for that other information web page, wherein that redirection web page includes an instruction for redirecting a client terminal to that other information web*. For at least this reason, Claim 43 is felt to distinguish over Fell. Claims 44-47 are also felt to distinguish over Fell based at least on their dependency from Claim 43.

Claim 44 is depends from Claim 43 and further recites:

(1) a first web server presenting a first information web page of the plurality of information web pages to a client terminal;

(2) receiving a request for a second information web page of the plurality of information web pages from the client terminal, the request corresponding to a selection of the indirect link included in the first information web page;

(3) determining if a second web server hosting the second information is operational; and

(4) returning, if the second web server is determined to be operational, to the client terminal the redirection web page for the second information web page, that redirection web page including an instruction for redirecting the client terminal to the second information web page.

As made clear with respect to Claims 22 and 33, nothing in Fell even hints at determining if a server hosting a requested web page is operational. All that Fell discusses is determining if a resource identifier included in a resource access request is current or has been previously used. Fell is silent on the operational status of a server hosting a requested resource. Moreover, as Fell does not teach the use of redirection

web pages, Fell does not disclose returning to the client terminal the redirection web page for the second web page where the returned redirection web page includes an instruction for redirecting the client terminal to the second information web page. Fell's SHASR apparatus (110) simply does not return a redirection web page to a client terminal. For at least this additional reason Claim 44 is felt to distinguish over Fell.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC § 103: The Examiner rejected Claims 23-29, 35-41 and 45-48 under §103 as being anticipated by USPN 6,826,624 issued to Fell in view of USPN 6,279,001 issued to DeBettencourt.

- Claims 23-29 are felt to distinguish over the cited references based at least on their dependence from Claim 21.
- Claims 35-41 are felt to distinguish over the cited references based at least on their dependence from Claim 32.
- Claims 45-48 are felt to distinguish over the cited references based at least on their dependence from Claim 43.

Conclusion: The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding Office Action. Claims 21-29, 31-41, and 43-48 are felt to be in condition for allowance. Consequently, early and favorable action allowing these claims and passing the application to issue is earnestly solicited. The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,
Allen D. Baker

By _____
Jack H. McKinney
Reg. No. 45,685

May 16, 2005